

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 2, 2009. Claims 1 and 3 to 16 are in the application, with Claims 7 to 12 and 14 to 16 having been withdrawn from consideration. Of the claims presented for examination, Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 to 6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0123072 (Spronk). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 as amended generally concerns an image processing apparatus for performing print simulation through a computer network. The image processing apparatus includes a device selector, arranged to select a target printer on the network as a print simulation target, and to select another printer on the network which is used to output a simulation result of the target printer, wherein the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, the target printer is present at another site, and the two sites are connected through the network. The image processing apparatus further includes a profile selector, arranged to select a profile required for a color matching process of the print simulation through the network, and to set the selected profile in the target printer, and a first transmitter, arranged to transmit image data on which are to be performed a color matching process and a rasterizing process to the target printer, wherein the target printer performs the color matching process according to the selected profile on received image data, and rasterizes the image data on which the color matching process has been performed. In addition, the image processing apparatus

includes a receiver, arranged to receive rasterized image data from the target printer, and a second transmitter, arranged to transmit the received and rasterized image data to the other printer so as to print an image that simulates color of an image which the target printer will print.

Thus, among its many features, independent Claim 1 provides that (i) an image apparatus includes (a) a device selector, arranged to select a target printer on the network as a print simulation target, and to select another printer on the network which is used to output a simulation result of the target printer, (b) a profile selector, arranged to select a profile required for a color matching process of the print simulation through the network, and to set the selected profile in the target printer, and (c) a receiver, arranged to receive rasterized image data from the target printer, and that (ii) the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, and the target printer is present at another site. The applied reference of Spronk is not seen to disclose or suggest at least these features.

The Office Action contended that Spronk discloses the foregoing claimed features. In its contention, the Office Action compared the following:

Claim 1	Spronk (Figure 1)
image processing apparatus	image preparation apparatus 14
device selector	color management unit 16
target printer	color printer 18
other printer	printing press 22
profile selector	ID creator unit 20
receiver	color management unit 16

Furthermore, the Office Action alleges that Spronk's image preparation apparatus 14 and printing press 22 are present at a single site, and that Spronk's color management unit 16, ID creation unit 20 and color printer 18 are present at another site. See Spronk, Figure 1.

In view of the foregoing, Spronk is not seen to disclose or suggest that an image apparatus includes the device selector, profile selector and receiver as claimed. As alleged in the Office Action, Spronk's image preparation apparatus 14 is in a single site and Spronk's color management unit 16 and ID creation unit 20 are at another site. As such, Spronk's image preparation apparatus 14 is not seen to include color management unit 16 and ID creation unit 20.

Accordingly, Spronk is not seen to disclose that (i) an image apparatus includes (a) a device selector, arranged to select a target printer on the network as a print simulation target, and to select another printer on the network which is used to output a simulation result of the target printer, (b) a profile selector, arranged to select a profile required for a color matching process of the print simulation through the network, and to set the selected profile in the target printer, and (c) a receiver, arranged to receive rasterized image data from the target printer. Furthermore, Spronk is not seen to disclose that (ii) the image processing apparatus and the other printer are present at a single site, and the target printer is present at another site.

Claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable over the applied reference.

In addition, independent Claim 13 is a method claim which generally corresponds to apparatus Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 13 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

No claim fees are believed due. However, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Finally, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner conduct a personal or telephonic interview with Applicant's representative regarding this case, before the Examiner takes this filing into consideration. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's representative as indicated below.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/John D. Magluyan/
John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCBS_WS 3912377v1